United Nations A/C.3/68/SR.46

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
6 January 2014

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 14 November 2013, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Tafrov ..... (Bulgaria)

Contents

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-56490 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.05 p.m.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.71: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Ms. Farngalo** (Liberia), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that Austria, Finland, Georgia, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain and Turkey had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. One third of the world's internally displaced persons were in Africa, and their numbers had increased significantly over the previous two years. Insecurity resulting from conflicts had not only uprooted millions of people, but also prevented many from returning home. The draft resolution underlined the need to draw on Africa's experience in dealing with displaced persons and returnees and to provide sustained financial support to meet the needs of those persons despite difficulties in mobilizing funding.

2. There were a few differences from the previous year's text: the General Assembly welcomed the entry into force of the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa and welcomed the ongoing implementation of pledges made by States in 2011 to mark the sixtieth anniversary of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and the fiftieth anniversary of the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness. It also welcomed the Executive Committee's recent adoption of the Conclusion on civil registration and requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive report on assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa to the General Assembly at its sixty-ninth session.

3. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Australia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Guinea, Ireland, Lithuania, Pakistan, Sweden and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 67: Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.69)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.69: Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

4. **Ms. Rokovucago** (Fiji), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, requested the Secretariat to amend the title to "Global efforts for the total elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and the comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action". In response to requests to streamline the draft resolution, the text had been shortened from 13 to 4 pages.

Agenda item 68: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.67 and A/C.3/68/L.68)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.67: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

5. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bahrain, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, Central African Republic, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Nicaragua, Rwanda and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

6. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Nigeria had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.68: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

7. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Albania, Belgium, Brunei Darussalam, Cabo Verde, Chile, Comoros, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Indonesia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors. The text was very similar to that of the previous year's resolution, with changes to the eighth and eleventh preambular

paragraphs. He hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would help to alleviate the suffering of the Palestinian people and eventually lead to the realization of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination in their own independent State of Palestine with East Jerusalem as its capital.

8. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Monaco, Niger, Nigeria, Peru, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Timor-Leste, Uganda and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.47, A/C.3/68/L.49, A/C.3/68/L.53, A/C.3/68/L.61 and A/C.3/68/L.63)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.49: Freedom of religion or belief

9. **Ms. Kazragienė** (Lithuania), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that Brazil, Japan, Lebanon and Paraguay had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution reflected the strong commitment of the European Union to promoting universal human rights, as demonstrated by its new Guidelines on the promotion and protection of freedom of religion or belief, and was intended as a follow-up action to the Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief. The European Union called on States to implement recommendations relating to freedom of religion or belief that were made in the context of the universal periodic review.

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Côte d'Ivoire, Papua New Guinea and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.47: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

11. **Mr. Kandeel** (Egypt), introducing the draft resolution, said that Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Ghana, Lebanon, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Uganda had joined the sponsors. He said that the draft resolution was particularly relevant in view of the upcoming negotiations on the post-2015 development agenda; the text emphasized the importance of putting development at the top of the international economic agenda and of narrowing the gap between rich and poor as a way of promoting human rights. Only minor changes had been made to the previous year's text; in the first paragraph of the draft resolution, the reference to the Charter of the United Nations had been changed from "guided by" to "reaffirming".

12. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Pakistan, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Togo and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.53: Follow-up to the International Year of Human Rights Learning

13. **Ms. Mballa Eyenga** (Cameroon), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Group of African States, said that Azerbaijan and Spain had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution was based on the text adopted two years previously, with a few updates. Paragraph 8, the only new paragraph, had been discussed at great length.

14. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia and Slovenia had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.61: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

15. **Ms. Diaz Gras** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that Argentina, Brazil, Colombia and Paraguay had joined the sponsors. Measures adopted to combat terrorism would only be effective and legitimate if States fulfilled their duty to promote and protect human rights. The draft resolution was intended to strengthen the human rights perspective in the provision of assistance to victims of terrorism and contained a stronger reference to the right of victims to

reparations. States were urged to guarantee that all measures adopted in the fight against terrorism, including the use of drones, complied with their obligations under international law and were reminded of the need to promptly conduct impartial inquiries if there were plausible indications of breaches of those obligations.

16. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Monaco and Peru had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.63: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

17. **Ms. Morch Smith** (Norway), introducing the draft resolution, said that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malta, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom had joined the sponsors. The sponsors had agreed on new wording in four areas: the role of development actors in finding durable solutions, the importance of developing domestic legislation and policies, the vulnerability and participation of women and the need to provide children with access to education.

18. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire, El Salvador, Mali, Monaco, Papua New Guinea, San Marino, Sierra Leone, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.42)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.42: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

19. **Mr. Alyas** (Saudi Arabia), introducing the draft resolution, said that Albania, Andorra, Bahrain, Denmark, Hungary, Malta, Mauritania, Panama, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Vanuatu and Yemen had joined the list of sponsors. It was unfortunately once again necessary to present a draft resolution on the situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic in view of the recent deterioration in that situation. The innocent victims in Syria were looking to the United Nations to condemn the Government of Syria, given the inability of the international community to take the necessary measures to put an end to the tragedy affecting that country. The text of the present draft resolution was based on that of previous United Nations resolutions, including those of the Human Rights Council, taking account of recent developments on the ground.

20. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia and San Marino had joined the sponsors.

21. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that the draft resolution, which constituted an attack against his country, had been introduced by the representative of a State that was not concerned about allowing its own citizens to enjoy fundamental freedoms, human rights and democracy. The draft resolution was yet another futile attempt by the Saudi regime and its allies to interfere in Syria's internal affairs; it made false claims and deliberately disregarded the Syrian Government's positive approach to finding a peaceful, political solution to the crisis in the country through cooperation and dialogue between Syrians.

22. Saudi Arabia had no parliament or constitution and prohibited women from driving or even cycling, and yet it had the audacity to challenge a country in which a woman held the office of Vice-President. The Saudi regime's real concern was Syria's balanced and objective approach to Arab identity and Islam, which ran counter to the *takfiri* Wahhabi terrorist approach sponsored by Saudi Arabia.

23. His delegation had met with many other delegations and regional groups to underline the contradictions contained in the text. The draft resolution was clearly a political manoeuvre; it was biased, contained numerous errors and contradictions, and would not help to find a political solution to the crisis. It merely aggravated the crisis by ignoring the positive progress achieved and turned attention away from the activities of terrorist groups linked to Al-Qaida which were supported by certain Member States, including the sponsors of the draft resolution.

24. The purpose of the draft resolution was to undermine the Geneva II conference. He recalled that Saudi Arabia had been the only State to refuse a recent visit from the Joint Special Representative of the United Nations and the League of Arab States for Syria. His delegation would request a vote before adoption of the draft resolution and urged all States to vote against it, since the United Nations was supposed to assist all States and not target individual ones. In targeting his country, Saudi Arabia was violating the

joint position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, of which it was a member.

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.46 and A/C.3/68/L.70)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.46: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

25. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

26. **Ms. Salovaara** (Finland), said that Argentina, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Kenya, Micronesia (the Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Paraguay, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Thailand and Ukraine had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution. The text had been negotiated in both Geneva and New York, and it was intended to serve as a vehicle for the General Assembly's continued support for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

27. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belarus, Benin, Burundi, Eritrea, Gabon, Honduras, Liberia, Papua New Guinea, Timor-Leste and Uganda had also joined the sponsors.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.46 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.70: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

29. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

30. **Ms. Skácelová** (Czech Republic), introducing the draft resolution, said that the original seven sponsors — Afghanistan, Belarus, Czech Republic, Latvia, Peru, Senegal and Slovakia — had expressed their interest in becoming members of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

31. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Papua New Guinea and the Russian Federation had also joined the sponsors.

32. **Mr. Bonser** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the decision to enlarge the membership of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to include Afghanistan, Czech Republic, Latvia, Peru, Senegal and Slovakia, but was firmly opposed to the inclusion of Belarus. His Government maintained a policy of limited engagement with the Government of Belarus, owing to the deplorable state of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law in that country, where the Government continued to restrict its citizens' ability to exercise their fundamental rights. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had a mandate to protect vulnerable persons the world over; Canada could only object to the proposal that President Lukashenko's dictatorial regime, which continued to repress and suppress the rights of ordinary Belarusians, should join that Office's Executive Committee. Canada supported freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in Belarus and would continue to work with like-minded countries and international organizations to ensure that the people of Belarus could exercise those fundamental rights.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.70 was adopted.*

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of human rights instruments (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.73)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1: Human Rights Committee

34. **The Chair** drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.3/68/L.73.

35. **Ms. Pöysäri** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries and the other sponsors of the draft resolution, said that Croatia, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Hungary, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Suriname and Turkey had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, which authorized the addition of one week of meeting time for the Committee in 2014,

including an adequate level of Secretariat resources as a measure to deal urgently with the backlog of communications under the first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights awaiting consideration. The adoption of the draft resolution would help to address that critical situation and to foster more tangible results in the treaty-body strengthening process.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Côte d'Ivoire, Tunisia and Ukraine had also joined the sponsors.

37. **Ms. Torres** (United States of America) said that her delegation supported the important work of the Human Rights Committee and other treaty bodies, and their role in advising States parties on implementation issues. The work of the Human Rights Committee was essential to the promotion and protection of rights under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The persistent backlog of reports and individual petitions remained a concern for Member States and other stakeholders, and a challenge to the ability of the Human Rights Committee to fully discharge its responsibilities. Her delegation appreciated the sponsors' efforts to identify additional cost-saving measures to minimize the budgetary impact of the Committee's request for additional meeting time.

38. While firmly supporting the goal of strengthening and enhancing the effectiveness of all human rights treaty bodies, including the Human Rights Committee, her delegation recognized that there were limits to Member States' ability to provide the necessary resources. Her own country's funding for international organizations had decreased significantly, while calls for closer scrutiny of the use and effectiveness of that funding had increased. Her delegation therefore called for an end to the practice of providing additional funding outside of the normal budget cycle, unless truly unforeseen and urgent humanitarian or security needs arose. Ad-hoc or stop-gap measures could undermine broader efforts to improve effectiveness and strengthen the treaty body system, and could ultimately be much more costly than systematic solutions.

39. Although the draft resolution was aimed primarily at reducing the backlog of individual petitions before the Human Rights Committee, her delegation had serious reservations vis-à-vis the effectiveness of solely adding meeting time, as other associated measures were also critical. The challenge of backlogs of reports and individual petitions was endemic to the treaty body system, and the backlogs were likely to increase as new Member States acceded to the human rights treaties and as optional protocols and related mechanisms entered into force. The treaty body system as a whole needed strengthening and her delegation therefore had not joined the consensus on the draft resolution. The international community should address those issues in a systematic and comprehensive way in the future.

40. **Ms. Belskaya** (Belarus), speaking in explanation of position before the decision, said that Belarus was a party to the majority of the international human rights instruments and attached great importance to the work of the treaty bodies. Her delegation noted with concern the significant backlog of communications awaiting review by the Human Rights Committee. That backlog, one of the largest backlogs in the treaty body system, was the result of not only the number of communications, but also the Committee's questionable formats and methods of work, which were mostly based on the Committee's internal rules of procedure and in some cases were not in keeping with or even contravened the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol thereto. The draft resolution thus sent an incongruous signal to the Committee and the States parties. The main sponsor had failed to take the submissions and proposals of her delegation into account during the negotiations, which had not been conducted in a transparent manner, and had failed to take into account the views of all interested parties. Belarus was a party to both the Covenant and to the Optional Protocol and it had the right, as a contributor to the United Nations budget, to participate in the allocation of budgetary resources. The main sponsors should adopt a more responsive, impartial, and constructive approach in preparing draft resolutions on such important issues. Her delegation deeply regretted that the sponsors had not managed to carry out the simple task of preparing a procedural resolution and reducing expenditure as much as possible.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.31/Rev.1 was adopted.*

42. **Ms. Burgess** (Canada) said that the significant backlog in individual communications was a matter for concern. She underscored the urgency of concluding the intergovernmental process on strengthening and enhancing the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system in February 2014 to ensure a

strengthened treaty body system that could effectively and efficiently defend human rights while operating within its budget. It was important to find a long-term solution to that issue, rather than an ad-hoc financial measure. Her delegation's position was to avoid programme budget implications where possible. On that basis alone, Canada had not joined the consensus, but awaited the results of the intergovernmental process.

43. **Mr. Hisajima** (Japan) also shared the concern about the backlog in communications awaiting consideration by the Human Rights Committee, a situation which required not an ad-hoc solution, but a long-term one. The intergovernmental process was the best means to strengthen and enhance the effective functioning of the human rights treaty body system, and to avoid additional budgetary implications. In the light of the severe financial situation facing the United Nations, it was regrettable that additional costs would be incurred by adding a week of meeting time. His delegation also had some concerns about the process itself, which had not taken into account the concerns of all States or provided sufficient opportunity for discussion. It also had doubts about the need for general temporary assistance at the P-3 level for 24 months. Japan attached great importance to the Committee's activities and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but needed further explanation from the Secretariat concerning the rationale and calculation for the estimated $1.5 million in additional resource requirements, which should be examined carefully through the budgetary process. The Secretariat should also try to absorb any additional costs within the proposed programme budget for the 2014-2015 biennium, and he hoped that the Human Rights Committee would further improve the efficiency of its working methods, in line with paragraph 1 of the resolution.

44. **Ms. Cross** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) said that her delegation had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but had concerns about the approach taken in that document as a solution was needed for a much wider problem. The genuine problems and heavy workload of the Human Rights Committee were a reflection of the Committee's success. A comprehensive solution was needed for the backlog of work which continued to accumulate. Her delegation welcomed the steps the Committee had taken to make its working methods more efficient, but the ad-hoc solution of lengthening the meeting time did not solve the problem. Her delegation was firmly committed to the treaty body strengthening process In future, a holistic approach should be adopted rather than ineffective and costly ad-hoc solutions.

45. **Mr. Cabouat** (France) said that his delegation attached great importance to the work of the Human Rights Committee and had joined the consensus on the draft resolution, but had some reservations about the approach adopted. The backlog was a cross-cutting issue that affected other treaty-bodies too, and it required a long-term and comprehensive solution. The initiative of adding meeting time could undermine current efforts for overall reform of the treaty bodies overall. It was crucial for committees to ensure that any changes to their working methods did not entail additional budgetary costs. It was in that constructive spirit that the budgetary implications of the draft resolution would be reviewed in the Fifth Committee.

46. **Ms. Hewanpola** (Australia) said that the treaty body system was the key international mechanism for the promotion and protection of human rights globally; enhancing its effective functioning was clearly critical. In the light of the pressures faced by that system, it was imperative to conclude the work of the General Assembly's intergovernmental process during the final phase of discussions in February 2014 and to agree on a substantive, comprehensive and long-term solution to strengthen the operations and effectiveness of the treaty body system. Her Government supported the work of the Human Rights Committee, including its consideration of individual communications, but the draft resolution sought only a temporary fix to one of the many issues faced by that Committee.

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.41 and A/C.3/68/L.72)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41: Strengthening the role of the United Nations in enhancing periodic and genuine elections and the promotion of democratization

47. **The Chair** announced that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

48. **Ms. Cousens** (United States of America) said that Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, India, Indonesia,

Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Morocco, the Philippines, the Republic of Moldova, Thailand, Tuvalu, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Zambia had also joined the sponsors.

49. The draft resolution had more than 90 sponsors, reflecting every region of the world. In line with the previous relevant resolution, the current one reaffirmed that democracy was a universal value based on the freely expressed will of the people to determine their own political, economic, social and cultural systems and their full participation in all aspects of their lives. It also included elements that had been incorporated in previous General Assembly resolutions on elections, recognizing the importance of free, fair, periodic, and genuine elections, including in new democracies and countries undergoing democratization, in order to empower citizens to express their will and promote successful transitions to sustainable democracies. The text also included two crucial new elements: the participation of women in the political and electoral process; and the unique challenges that persons with disabilities faced in participating in electoral processes, including physical barriers to participation.

50. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burundi, Côte d'Ivoire and Madagascar had also joined the sponsors.

51. **The Chair** drew attention to draft amendment A/C.3/68/L.72 to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41, and noted that the amendment had no programme budget implications.

52. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that the issues raised in draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 were extremely important for strengthening democratic institutions in Member States, as well as in terms of the international community providing assistance to those institutions. His delegation supported many of the elements contained in the text, but since its own proposals had not been included, it had been obliged to prepare a separate draft amendment (A/C.3/68/L.72).

53. The amendment reflected his delegation's wish, as expressed at the sixty-fourth session of the General Assembly, to remove the reference to the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, as they had not been the result of any intergovernmental experts' agreement or part of any intergovernmental process. His delegation was opposed in principle to the attempt to legitimize, by a General Assembly resolution, documents developed by a group of non-governmental organizations when those documents had not been discussed at the intergovernmental level. His delegation fully supported the aim of harmonizing the methods and standards for international election observation, as expressed in the first part of paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, as his delegation had long advocated such action at various levels, including in the context of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

54. His delegation believed that the draft amendment made the draft resolution more balanced. Should the amendment be deemed unacceptable by the sponsors of the draft resolution, he would request a recorded vote and appeal for the Committee to support.

55. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the Syrian Arab Republic and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had joined the sponsors to the draft amendment.

56. **Ms. Torres** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote against the amendment to paragraph 11 and encouraged other delegations to do same. With its proposed amendment, the Russian delegation sought to delete consensus language that had been included in the relevant draft resolution for nearly a decade; the Committee and the General Assembly had agreed on that language, which merely reflected appreciation for the Declaration of Principles for International Election Observation and the Code of Conduct for International Election Observers, which had been endorsed by the African Union, European Commission, the Organization of American States and many other organizations. She urged delegations to vote against the proposed amendment, just as they had done in 2009 and 2011.

57. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft amendment contained in A/C.3/68/L.72.

58. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.72, contained in document A/C.3/68/L.41.*

In favour:

Algeria, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brunei Darussalam, China, Congo, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian

Federation, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Oman, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Zambia.

59. *The proposed amendment to draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 contained in document A/C.3/68/L.72 was rejected by 94 votes to 29, with 33 abstentions.*

60. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.41 as a whole was adopted.*[1]

[1] The delegation of Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution, and the delegation of Burundi that it had intended to abstain.

61. **Mr. Matlhako** (South Africa) said that South Africa, as a State party to the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, had participated constructively in the consultations on the resolution. His Government was concerned at some aspects of the text, in particular the description of the type of environment that would be conducive to elections. It was assumed that all States were at the same level of development with regard to election preparations. The text also failed to fully address all aspects of election logistics, which hinged on the availability of human and financial resources, including the role of the judiciary.

62. It was difficult to understand the decision to reject language based on paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Furthermore, the comprehensive contributions made by his delegation had not been taken into account. He hoped that the main sponsor would adopt a different approach in any future negotiations.

63. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba) said that the language of the final preambular paragraph of the resolution did not take into account the earlier discussions regarding the need for a human rights focus in the post-2015 development agenda. That focus should be fully supported by an analysis of the interdependency of the various categories of human rights. Cuba did not agree with a selective focus that prioritised certain elements in terms of human rights and democracy, as such an approach was detrimental to economic, social and cultural rights. With regard to democracy, genuine and periodic elections were just one requirement for ensuring the participation and full enjoyment by peoples of the riches generated by their labour and the use of natural resources.

Agenda item 108: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1 and A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1: Improving the coordination of efforts against trafficking in persons

64. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme budget implications in accordance with rule 153 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly, drew the attention of the Committee to paragraphs 4, 8, 12, 16 and 18 of draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 64/293, two

regular budget posts had been approved under section 16 of the programme budget for the biennium 2012-2013. Accordingly, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) had one regular budget post allocated for the delivery of technical assistance in the fields of human trafficking and migrant smuggling, and one regular budget post dedicated to the preparation of the Global Report on Trafficking in Persons. No additional resources would be required for the four-year appraisal if it was conducted in the same manner as in May 2013.

65. Drawing attention to the actions required to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, he noted that UNODC had received an earmarked contribution of $600,000 in 2012 to support its coordinating role in the Inter-Agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT) and the production of five thematic papers to be used in technical assistance activities. An increased level of activities in 2013 would require additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $482,800.

66. UNODC would require additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $946,000 over three years to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 12, and additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $154,100 to implement the activities related to the request made in paragraph 16. With regard to the activities related to the request made in paragraph 18, additional extrabudgetary resources in the amount of $71,800 would be required for a 16-page report in six languages and a professional post at the P-4 level for two months for preparation of that report. Should the additional extrabudgetary resources referred to not be available, the activities would not take place.

67. **Mr. Lazarev** (Belarus), introducing the draft resolution, said that Australia, China, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, India, Italy, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Portugal, Serbia, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors. Since the adoption of the first resolution on crime prevention and criminal justice, the Inter-agency Coordination Group against Trafficking in Persons (ICAT) and the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children had been established, and the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons had been adopted. In September 2013, Belarus had initiated consultations with civil society to discuss the implementation of international efforts to counter human trafficking.

68. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Burkina Faso, Lesotho, Niger and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors.

69. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking on behalf of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), said that trafficking in persons was one of the most dangerous forms of transnational organized crime and was carried out by highly organized criminal groups that undermined the rule of law. CSTO called for concrete actions to implement the United Nations Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and welcomed the designation of a world day against trafficking in persons, which would help to raise the awareness of the international community and consolidate the efforts of all partners in that respect.

70. CSTO also supported the idea of a periodic appraisal of the implementation of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons because it would encourage international cooperation and would support cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. The experience of CSTO in combating illegal migration, which was often linked to trafficking in persons, could be of interest to many other States and international organizations. CSTO member States confirmed their willingness to address the issue of organized crime through international cooperation.

71. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.17/Rev.1 was adopted.*

72. **Ms. Hampe** (Lithuania), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that she commended the efforts of Belarus to raise awareness about the situation of victims of human trafficking and to promote and protect their human rights. However, rather than designating a world day, it might have been more effective to make use of existing synergies for that purpose. The May 2013 High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons had demonstrated the importance of promoting and protecting the rights of victims and the essential role of civil society in the efforts to combat human trafficking.

73. Any future appraisal of the Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, including the implementation of relevant legal instruments, should

allow for the action-oriented assessment of gaps and challenges and include the participation of all relevant stakeholders. The appraisal should also be conducted within existing resources.

74. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocols, in particular the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, were the main legal instruments for the efforts to combat human trafficking. The Global Plan of Action was a complementary instrument for those efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

75. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

76. **Mr. Manana** (Uganda), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the African Group, said that criminal activity remained a major impediment to the socioeconomic development of the African continent. Transnational organized crime in particular was a serious cause for concern in view of Africa's weak crime prevention structures. The United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders had been established to address the increasing levels of crime and delinquency that threatened to subvert development efforts in African countries.

77. Continued efforts to strengthen collaboration and forge new partnerships would enhance the Institute's ability to conduct its work. The draft resolution retained much of the language from the texts of previous years, while several changes had been made to reflect new developments.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.3/68/L.20/Rev.1 was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.